

Application No. 10/784,093

Reply to Office Action

REMARKSDiscussion of Claim Amendment

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the coating is a continuous uniform coating. Dependent claims 36-37 have been amended accordingly. No new matter has been added.

The Office Action

The Office Action sets forth the following grounds for rejection:

1. Claims 1-7 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by Nishio et al. (USP 5,856,009);
2. Claims 1, 2, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b); as allegedly anticipated by Ranby et al. (USP 4,396,863) or Okada et al. (USP 5,523,018); and
3. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Ranby et al.


Discussion

Applicants have amended claims 1, 36, and 37 to recite that the coating is uniform. The Examiner indicated in a telephone call on March 16, 2005, that the claims would be allowable if such an amendment is made. Accordingly, applicants believe that the claims are now in an allowable condition. None of the cited references discloses or suggests to those of ordinary skill in the art a uniform coating. Accordingly, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance. The amendment places the application in condition for allowance or in a better condition for consideration on appeal. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Xavier Pillai, Reg. No. 39,799
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: June 27, 2005

Page 3 of 3